



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/938,939

08/24/2001

Janakiram Koka

YAHOO-01008US1

2665

23910

7590

01/13/2006

FLIESLER MEYER, LLP
FOUR EMBARCADERO CENTER
SUITE 400
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111

EXAMINER

JEAN, FRANTZ B

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/938,939

Applicant(s)

KOKA ET AL.

Examiner

Frantz B. Jean

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 October 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to applicants' amendment filed on 10/11/2005. Claim 4 has been canceled. Claims 1-3 and 5-21 are still pending in this office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 and 5-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 3, 5-13, and 15-4 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (6,424,828) in view of Cannon et al. US Publication Number 2002/0016736 A1.

As per claim 1, Collins discloses determining a chunk size limit; dividing a web page data into segments having a size no greater than the chunk size limit; and linking the chunks in sequence (figures 8 and 9, column 3, lines 25-53, column 11, lines 25-31, column 12, lines 31-43, column 13, lines 15-20). However, Collins does not explicitly detail on a linking that comprises inserting a link in one of the chunks comprising a link to another of the chunks. Cannon is directed to a method of determining suitable breaks for inserting content that comprises inserting a link in one of the chunks (segments)

comprising a link to another of the chunks (segments) (see paragraph 0143, 0145-0164). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have combined Cannon method to Collins to facilitate information transfer between different devices.

As per claims 3 and 15, Collins discloses the linking step in sequential order (column 11, lines 25-32, column 13, lines 15-20).

As per claim 6, Collins discloses determining whether the chunk limit falls on a word or element boundary and establishing a break point at a position or element boundary (column 11, lines 25-32).

As per claim 12, Collins discloses determining where the gateway limit falls in the content data; and parsing the content data into at least a first segment and at least a next segment of a size at or below the gateway limit at break points not falling within a word, or element boundary (figures 8 and 9, column 3, lines 25-53, column 11, lines 25-31, column 12, lines 31-43, column 13, lines 15-20). However, Collins does not explicitly detail on a linking that comprises inserting a link in one of the chunks comprising a link to another of the chunks. Cannon is directed to a method of determining suitable breaks for inserting content that comprises inserting a link in one of the chunks (segments) comprising a link to another of the chunks (segments) (see paragraph 0143, 0145-0164). One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have combined Cannon method to Collins to facilitate information transfer between different devices.

As per claim 13, Collin discloses linking the first segment and said at least next segment (column 4, lines 56-59, column 11, lines 25-32, column 13, lines 15-20).

As per claim 17, Collins discloses determining whether the gateway limit falls on a word or element boundary and establishing a break point at a position or element boundary (column 11, lines 25-32).

As per claims 7, 8, 18 and 19, Collins discloses the break point falling on a word is determined and positioned on a new and/or end of line indicator (column 11, lines 25-32).

As per claims 5 and 16, Collins discloses determining the point where the chunk size limit is reached; and creating a table/list addresses to subsequent chunks (column 5, lines 43-67, column 6, lines 1-18).

As per claims 9 and 20, Collins discloses creating a table identifying each of the segments and fixing addresses in the segments (column 5, lines 43-67, column 6, lines 1-18).

As per claims 10 and 21, Collins discloses the e-mail message includes a communication greater than a maximum communication length imposed by the SMS (abstract). Therefore, there is a fixed length.

As per claim 11, Collins discloses the use of domain names (column 5, line 49 and column 6, line 20).

Claims 2 and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins et al (6,424,828) and Cannon.

Collins and Cannon teach how to link in a sequential order. However, they do not teach how to link in a non-sequential order. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use a non-sequential order in order to provide another advantages to the communications means such as classification and/or prioritizing packets, which are in a non-sequential order. Therefore, two communicating parties in that the sender must be paced by the receiver so that the receiver is not overrun with packets arriving faster than can be processed.

Levy et al Pub Number 2002/0033844 A1 (par 0039 et seq) and Jilk, Jr. Et al. Pub Number 2002/0010746 A1 (par 0114) contain limitations that are relevant to the claimed invention. Applicants are requested to consider those references upon responding to this office action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Frantz B. Jean whose telephone number is 571-272-3937. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-6:00 M-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on 571 272 3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Frantz Jean



FRANTZ B. JEAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER